2: Underhill E-5 (1931-1935)1939 NU28 Papago NU28



be thanked by the council. The record of the calendar stick is punctuated with such executions.

Murder, in the Papago view, was not a crime. It took place generally at the drinking feast or in a quarrel over a woman, and the victim's family then had a right to kill the murderer or a member of his family. The Keeper, governor and elders remonstrated with them and begged them not to make the village lose a man, but if they insisted, "no one would interfere." One instance was recited where the murderer had fled the country but his brother was still in the village. The victim's brothers came to the door of his house and told him: "We are going to kill you. Send your wife and children away." He sent them away and then came to meet his executioners. After his death his wife tore down the house, according to the usual custom and all the village united in rebuilding it for her at another place and in helping to support her for life (2).

Murder was considered by the Spaniards a crime for which the offender should be delivered to the provincial authorities, but the Papago ignored the ruling except when soldiers or priests were sent to enforce it. Assault and battery was considered a family affair, like murder and in old times it was left to the people concerned. However, the priests thought it a matter for the whipping post and in some places it came to have that penalty.

There was considerably less scope for sexual offenses than in modern society and a man, particularly, had a great deal of freedom. If he conceived a sudden passion, he could always take the woman as an additional wife, after the proper preliminaries of divorce for a married woman or proposal for a maiden. There were official nights of saturnalia, at the drinking feast and the maiden's dance when he could gratify a briefer desire. Homosexual tendencies were openly acknowledged and sanctioned.

Yet sexual offenses did occur. Rape is never mentioned and an illicit affair with a maiden was not important, but one with a married woman, without the proper divorce, was an infringement of the husband's property right. The husband could destroy or appropriate the lover's property and, if he killed him, would not be interfered with. A woman had less freedom and less consolation. There were no female transvestites and a woman could take advantage of the saturnalian feasts only with her husband's consent. She could have only one husband and, if she preferred another man must be divorced and become a second wife. If her husband was having a love affair, she had no remedy but to scratch the other woman while the village looked on. When too much outraged, she

2: Underhill E-5 (1931-1935)1939 NU28 Papago NU28



to bring to the court their family difficulties as they brought them to the governor under the old regime. Problems of rape and illegitimacy, which did not figure under the system of polygyny, are beginning to appear. These and other major offenses are dealt with by the Federal courts.

Under the Indian Reorganization Act, the Indian courts will have jurisdiction over a definite number of offenses punishable under American law. The transition to a code of morals consonant with that of the individualistic and property conscious society around them should proceed rapidly and the rate and manner of adaptation in the different departments of morals will furnish an illuminating study.

# [Arizona Labor Camps]

674
578 A glance at newspaper files gives examples of the physical danger labor camp residents live under. George Butler, a farm worker, was knifed in the throat in a roadside tavern by another cotton picker in Pinal county.[1] Leonard Baker was shot outside the tent he shared with a common-law wife in a Pima county camp.[2] The mystery surrounding the death of a Papago man found on the desert in Pinal county remains unsolved at this writing.

The Eloy area is infamous for its deaths by violence in recent years of cotton field expansion. Cotton picker Alonzo Davis is in the Arizona State Prison after killing a friend in a labor camp in a drunken stupor.[3] Another cotton picker beat a drinking companion's brains out with a pipe to rob him.[4] An itinerant harvester accused the postmaster of witholding his mail, and gunned him down on the street before being slain by a wounded deputy sheriff.[5] And these are only examples.

[839] Death is not the only form of violence the non-aggressive Desert People face in labor camps. A 14 year old Papago school girl was raped by 3 men who seized her as she carried home her groceries one night in 1950.[6]

## COSTS

362
466 In spite of their great dependence on hands living in their labor camps, southern Arizona farmers don't invest much in labor efficiency in the farm of good labor housing in their camps. This fact is obvious to anyone driving the highways of Pinal or Pima county. But stating the fact in terms of dollars is very difficult, due to marked reluctance of cotton growers to discuss the amount they have invested in camp housing. This reluctance, we may guess, springs from a guilty conscience over the poor quality of the labor camps, and past experience with unfavorable publicity in city newspapers.

The meager data which could be gathered in this study indicates, though it does no more than indicate, that the average cotton farmer in the region spends some $4,000 on his labor camp.[7] Actually an average of labor camp costs

---

[1] Arizona Daily Star, Nov. 5, 1950.
[2] Tucson Daily Citizen, April 21, 1951.
[3] Sloter, n.d., p. 13
[4] Ibid., p. 17.
[5] Ibid., p. 23-27.
[6] Tucson Daily Citizen, Sept. 25, 1950.
[7] Data on original investment in labor housing was obtained